

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/914,436

Applicant(s)

HOPPE ET AL.

Examiner

Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1732

## All Participants:

(1) Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.

(2) James R. Franks.

Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 28 October 2004

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

## Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

1-9

Claims discussed:

1-9

Prior art documents discussed:

that cited.

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

## Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's argument with respect to the original fibers remaining in the instant process is persuasive. The preambles of the claims 1 and 7 were proposed to have the word "fibrous" added to make it clear that the product also contained the fibers. Luhmann's product is non-fibrous..